

REMARKS

Claims 36-41 are pending in the subject application.

Applicants have canceled claims 1-35, and have added new claims 36-41. These changes do not introduce any new matter.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

In light of the cancellation of claims 34 and 35, the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is moot.

New Claims

As noted above, Applicants have canceled claims 1-35 in favor of new claims 36-41. Independent claim 36 defines a digital camera, which is connected to a USB interface in a connection mode. The digital camera includes a controller, which is operable to change the connection mode in accordance with a condition of the digital camera. The connection mode includes a first mode in which the digital camera is in communication with a printer with an interrupt channel, and a second mode in which the digital camera is in communication with a computer without the interrupt channel. Claims 37 and 38 define further features of the digital camera specified in claim 36.

Independent claim 39 defines a system that includes a computer, a printer, and a digital camera. The digital camera has the same features specified in claim 36. Claims 40 and 41 define further features of the system specified in claim 39.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the Office Action, the Examiner 1) rejected claims 4, 6, 7, 9-11, and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Honma* (US 6,304,313 B1), and 2) rejected claims 23, 30-33, and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Watanabe* (US 7,310,112 B1). In light of the cancellation of claims 1-35, rejections 1) and 2) are moot.

To the extent that rejections 1) and 2) might be considered applicable to new claims 36-41, Applicants respond as follows. Applicants have drafted each of independent claims

36 and 39 to include subject matter that is not disclosed in either the *Honma* reference or the *Watanabe* reference. As such, claims 36-41 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102 over the *Honma* and *Watanabe* references.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action, the Examiner 1) rejected claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Inoue et al.* (“*Inoue*”) (US 6,273,535 B1) in view of *Honma*, 2) rejected claims 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Inoue* in view of *Honma* and *Watanabe*, 3) rejected claims 5, 8, 18-20, 25, 28, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Honma* in view of *Inoue*, 4) rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Honma* in view of *Watanabe*, 5) rejected claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Honma* in view of *Watanabe* and *Inoue*, 6) rejected claims 24 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Watanabe* in view of *Inoue*, and 7) rejected claims 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Honma* in view of *Inoue* and *Watanabe*. In light of the cancellation of claims 1-35, rejections 1) to 7) are moot.

To the extent that rejections 1) to 7) might be considered applicable to new claims 36-41, Applicants respond as follows. Applicants have drafted each of independent claims 36 and 39 to include subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested in the *Inoue*, *Honma*, and *Watanabe* references. Thus, even if the *Inoue*, *Honma*, and *Watanabe* references were to be combined in the manner proposed by the Examiner, the result of this combination would not have included each and every feature of the subject matter defined in claims 36 and 39. As such, the combination of the *Inoue*, *Honma*, and *Watanabe* references would not have rendered the subject matter defined in claims 36 and 39 obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art. Accordingly, claims 36-41 are believed to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over any combination of the *Inoue*, *Honma*, and *Watanabe* references.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request examination of claims 36-41, and submit that these claims are in condition for allowance. In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at **(408) 749-6902**. If any fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper, then the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. NGBCP007).

Respectfully submitted,
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP

/Peter B. Martine/

Peter B. Martine
Registration No. 32,043

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200
Sunnyvale, California 94085
Customer No. 25920